

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/665,574 09/18/2000		9/18/2000	Daniel I. Flitcroft	032668-026	6529		
21839	7590	07/29/2004		EXAMINER			
BURNS DO	OANE SW	ECKER & MAT	CUFF, MICHAEL A				
POST OFFIC		· = ·	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	,			3627	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
				DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
Office Action Summary			plication No.		Applicant(s)				
			/665,574		FLITCROFT ET AL.				
			aminer		Art Unit				
		Mic	hael Cuff		3627	MW			
The N Period for Reply	IAILING DATE of this commu I	nication appears	on the cover s	heet with the co	orrespondence ad	Idress			
THE MAILIN - Extensions of ti after SIX (6) MC - If the period for - If NO period for - Failure to reply Any reply receiv	IED STATUTORY PERIOD F G DATE OF THIS COMMUN me may be available under the provision: DNTHS from the mailing date of this com- reply specified above, its maximum serily is specified above, the maximum serily is specified above, the maximum serily its provided by the Office later than three months form adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In munication. 30) days, a reply within tatutory period will apply will, by statute, cause	In no event, howeve the statutory minim ly and will expire SIX the application to b	or, may a reply be time um of thirty (30) days K (6) MONTHS from the ecome ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)⊠ Respo	nsive to communication(s) fil	ed on 13 May 20	004.						
· ·	• •	2b) ☐ This action							
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of C	Claims								
4a) Of t 5) ☐ Claim(s 6) ☑ Claim(s 7) ☐ Claim(s 8) ☐ Claim(s	Claim(s) 1-15,17-21 and 28-56 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-15,17-21 and 28-56 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Pap	ers					·			
10)⊡ The dra Applica Replace	ecification is objected to by the wing(s) filed on is/are nt may not request that any objected to drawing sheet(s) including the second of the second	: a) ☐ accepted ection to the drawing the correction is	ng(s) be held in required if the o	abeyance. See drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl	• •			
11) Ine oai	h or declaration is objected t	o by the Examin	ier. Note the a	ttached Office /	Action or form P	10-152.			
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	riedgment is made of a claim b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation attached detailed Office action	documents have documents have of the priority do	re been receiv re been receiv ocuments hav T Rule 17.2(a	ed. ed in Applicatio e been received)).	on No d in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) ⊠ Notice of Refe	rences Cited (PTO-892)		4) ∏ In:	terview Summary (l	PTO-413)				
2) D Notice of Draft	sperson's Patent Drawing Review (I sclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		5) <u> </u>	per No(s)/Mail Dat)-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/665,574

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 5/13/04, has been received and entered. The examiners concurs with applicant that the Austin reference cannot be used because of the Irish priority dates. This action has been made final base on being necessitated by amendment from the first rejection, maile 8/18/03. IDS, filed 6/23/04, paper #11, has also been received.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 17-21 and 28-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (6,163,771) in view of Nakagawa.

Walker et al. shows all of the limitations of the claims except for use-triggered deactivation.

Walker et al. shows a credit card system that includes a means for maintaining a pool of credit card numbers with identical formatting (col. 6, line 30+), assigning at least one of the numbers from the pool to be a master credit card number (col. 6, line 45+, col. 6, line 57+), randomly assigning at least one credit card number from the pool to be a limited-use number (col. 6, line 45+, col. 12, lines 8+, col. 12, lines 35+), transmitting and processing a transaction message (see figures 2 and 3a), authorizing or denying

Art Unit: 3627

the transaction (310, figure 3a, col. 6, lines 48+), and associating the master credit card number with the limited-use credit card number in a manner that prevents discovery of the master credit card number (col. 6, lines 29+). The system includes a means for determining if a limited-use card number has been used. The limited-use credit card number could be good for only a single use (abstract) and could have a prescribed monetary value (col 6, line 25, common practice). The system maintains a queue of available limited-use credit card numbers. The system includes a means for providing an encrypted limited-use number to the user and it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the number could be provided in a variety of manners (col 4, lines 1+)

Nakagawa teaches, figure 10, a stage in which a rental contract is terminated. When the user 106 wants to terminate a rental contract 152, he/she returns his/her rental equipment and presents his/her credit card. The rental company 100 uses the credit card presented by the user 106 so as to make a credit accounting service cancellation application 154 to the mobile communication company 102 in order to settle up expenses.

Based on the teaching of Austin, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Walker et al. system to incorporate the card cancellation method of Nakagawa in order to settle up expenses.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 17-21 and 28-56 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9326. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Michael luff 7/27/04 Michael Cuff July 27, 2004